

**Meeting Summary and Action Items
BDPAC Water Supply Subcommittee
November 7, 2002
Bonderson Building Hearing Room
901 P Street
Sacramento, California 95814**

Welcome and Introductions

The following subcommittee members attended the meeting:

Steve Hall, Co-chair
Jerry Meral, Co-chair
Gary Bobker
Bernice Sullivan
Richard Denton
Randall Neudeck
Dave Fogerson

Current State and Federal Budget Status

Storage

Steve Roberts, the Department of Water Resources' Surface Storage Investigations Manager, presented the 5-year budget plan (fiscal years 2001 through 2005) for the five Surface Storage Projects and for groundwater and conjunctive use projects (see PowerPoint presentation posted on the CALFED website under Meeting Materials for details). It includes unmet needs for fiscal year 2003. While the passage of Proposition 50 will certainly support the surface storage programs, there will continue to be additional unmet resource requirements until the federal government provides authorization and appropriations for the storage programs.

Roberts stated that the funding for groundwater management and conjunctive use is not clear. Proposition 50, Chapter 7, provides \$180-million for:

“...water supply reliability projects that can be implemented expeditiously and thereby provide near-term benefits, including, but not limited to, projects that facilitate groundwater management and storage, water transfers, and acquisition of water for the CALFED environmental water account.”

How the \$180-million will be divided between groundwater, transfers, and EWA is not clear, but discussions are taking place with CALFED and Proposition 50 authors. In addition, Proposition 50, Chapter 8, Integrated Regional Water Management, may provide additional opportunities for groundwater management and storage. Steve Hall mentioned that there is a bond to be put on the November 2004 ballot for water infrastructure. The Surface Storage Projects may need to accelerate their

schedules to complete the environmental documentation and engineering feasibility studies before the bond is put on the ballot. It was pointed out that there is already a \$23 billion bond line up for the November 2004 ballot. Do we want the storage bond to compete with the \$23 billion bond?

Action Item: DWR and U.S. Bureau of Reclamation storage staff need to review and update schedules for the five storage projects in order to provide information that adequately satisfies the needs of a 2004 bond issue.

Conveyance

Don Kurosaka, DWR's Clifton Court Forebay Intake Study Manager, presented the budget plan and schedule for conveyance projects (see PowerPoint presentation posted on the CALFED website under Meeting Materials for details).

Steve Hall suggested a decision on the Tracy Fish Test Facility soon before too much money is spent.

Action Item: Steve Hall asked Kathy Kelly, DWR's Bay-Delta Office Chief to brief the BDPAC Water Supply Subcommittee on the schedule of the 10,300 cfs Banks Clifton Court Forebay fish screens and its dependence on the Tracy Fish Test Facility schedule. A tentative range of dates were set for early to mid-December 2002.

Transfers

Jerry Johns, DWR's Chief of the Office of Water Transfers gave a brief update on the status of the OWT's budget. Jerry is handicapped by a lack of staff to carry out the functions of his office, but is currently preparing both environmental documents for future water transfers and preparing a paper of the Environmental Water Account Acquisition Strategy.

Demand Management Actions

Greg Young, consultant with Saracino-Kirby-Snow, gave a presentation on Draft Demand Management Actions (water use efficiency, desalination, and conservation) designed for use in developing Common Assumptions (see PowerPoint presentation posted on the CALFED website under Meeting Materials for details).

The following comments were noted:

1. A suggestion was made to include Trinity River region in our demand management regions.
2. Table of conservation, local supply augmentation and transfer projects should be refined in its presentation to reflect:
 - a. Reduction in recoverable losses do not constitute new water

- b. The values presented are for purposes of assisting with the analysis of these values on overall system benefits
 - c. Transfers are not a “supply augmentation” as currently listed, but a reallocation
 - d. Recoverable losses and transfers can be characterized as changes in use
- 3. A concern was raised regarding the current values for urban conservation show no “reduction in irrecoverable loss”, when there is irrecoverable losses that can be conserved, especially landscaping.
- 4. It was noted that the long-term land fallowing values representing the No Action and the Alternative Future might really be a lot closer in magnitude than currently shown.
- 5. There was a comment that the San Joaquin River Drainage Program has much more land fallowing than the Common Assumptions numbers show.
- 6. The committee requested a report back regarding the line of demarcation for “existing conditions”. Whatever is chosen may have implications on demand management quantity and other quantity projections. It is also a concern with regard to desires by stakeholders to get “credit” for money “contributed” toward CALFED activities over the last 3 years (since the signing of the ROD), especially when considering statements in the ROD regarding cost-sharing.